

**REMARKS**

Claims 13-25 are pending. Claims 1-12 have been cancelled in a previously-filed paper. Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 14-16, 18, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 17, 19-23, and 25 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 13-25 remain for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to claims 17, 19-23, and 25 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Patent No. GB 2,293,476 (hereinafter “the ‘476 patent”). The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The ‘476 patent discloses a magnetic card reader that allegedly prevents a card with information stored thereon from being fraudulently used. Such a card reader includes a card running path accessible through a card insertion slot. The card running path includes a card detection magnetic head located to read a magnetic stripe of an inserted magnetic card, a pat roller that opposes the magnetic head, a shutter, a magnetic head that reads and writes magnetic information, a magnetic head for destroying magnetic information, card feeding rollers, driven rollers that oppose the card feeding rollers, and card sensors arranged to sense the presence of a card inserted into the running path. When an inserted magnetic card fails to completely pass over the sensors before an elapse of a given amount of time, an emergency stop operation is conducted. In the emergency stop operation, a central processing unit (CPU) monitors the amount of time the magnetic card resides in the running path. If a preset allotted time is exceeded, thus triggering the emergency stop operation, an encoder detects the rotation of the card

feeding rollers, thereby allowing the movement of the magnetic card to be monitored. On the basis of the encoder output supplied to the CPU in the emergency stop operation, the magnetic head for destroying magnetic information is driven so as to generate a strong magnetic field. Accordingly, when the magnetic card is pulled out of the running path, the magnetic stripe of the magnetic card is subject to the magnetic head for destroying magnetic information, and data magnetically stored on the card is destroyed.

The '476 patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a card tray as recited in claim 13. The Examiner refers to Figure 1 of the '476 patent as teaching the card tray, but no card tray is shown. The card reader of the '476 patent instead relies on the use of paired, opposing rollers to support an inserted card. A card tray, as recited in claim 13, is not a configuration of paired, opposing rollers, as disclosed in the '476 patent.

The '476 patent further fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a holding device that is activated if a change in the position of the card is not detected even though a conveying signal has been issued to the card-transporting device, as recited in claim 13. As recited in claim 13, the card is retained by the holding device in the event of manipulation of the card-processing apparatus. In contrast, in the device of the '476 patent, in the event of an emergency stop operation initiated in response to an attempt to wrongly manipulate the card, the card (magnetically de-activated) is returned to the user. More particularly, in the present invention the card is retained in the card processing apparatus if the appropriate signal is issued, whereas in the reader of the '476 patent the card is returned to the user. A holding device that is activated if a change in the position of the card is not detected even though a conveying signal has been issued to the card-transporting device, as recited in claim 13, is not a card reader in which a magnetically de-activated card is returned to the user in the event of an attempt to wrongly manipulate the card, as in the '476 patent.

Because the '476 patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a card tray as recited in claim 13, claim 13 is not anticipated by the '476 patent. Furthermore, because the '476 patent fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a holding device that is activated if a change in the position of the card is not detected even though a conveying signal has been issued to the card-transporting device as recited in claim 13, claim 13 is further not anticipated by

the ‘476 patent. For at least these reasons, claim 13 is allowable, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 13.

Claims 14-16, 18, and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘476 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,480,181 to Fisher (hereinafter “Fisher”). With regard to claim 14, the Examiner alleges that the ‘476 patent teaches all of the features of the claimed invention except that the holding device has at least one gripper, but that Fisher teaches this feature, and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the holding device taught by the ‘476 patent with the holding device of Fisher. With regard to claims 15, 16, and 18, the Examiner alleges that Fisher teaches various aspects of the gripper. With regard to claim 24, the Examiner alleges that “Fisher teaches that the holding device of which has at least one bolt 30, which is brought into contact with one of the side of the card and penetrates the card when the holding device is activated.”

Because claims 14-16, 18, and 24 depend from claim 13, and because claim 13 is non-obvious, claims 14-16, 18, and 24 are also necessarily non-obvious. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claims 14-16, 18, and 24 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 14-16, 18, and 24 be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein are allowable. An early action to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants’ attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Applicants believe that no fees are due with the submission of this Response. If any additional charges are incurred with respect to this Amendment, they may be charged to Deposit Account No. 503342 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Richard R. Michaud/  
Richard R. Michaud  
Registration No. 40,088  
Attorney for Applicants

Michaud-Duffy Group LLP  
CenterPoint  
306 Industrial Park Road  
Suite 206  
Middletown, CT 06457-1532  
Tel: (860) 632-7200  
Fax: (860) 632-8269